

Exhibit 1



**Transcript of Proceedings had in
Kathleen Koch v. Vantage Specialty Chemicals,
Inc.; et al.**

Taken On: July 25, 2024

Royal Reporting Services, Inc.
Phone: 312.361.8851
Email: info@royalreportingservices.com
Website: royalreportingservices.com

Kathleen Koch v. Vantage Specialty Chemicals, Inc.; et al.
Proceedings had on 7/25/2024

Page 1

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

KATHLEEN KOCH,)
)
Plaintiff,)
v.) No. 2023 L 686
)
VANTAGE SPECIALTY) All Consolidated
CHEMICALS, INC.; et al.,) Cases
)
Defendants.)

Report of proceedings had at the hearing in
the above-entitled cause before the HONORABLE JOHN H.
EHRLICH, Judge of said Court, at Richard J. Daley
Center, 50 West Washington Street, Room 2306, Chicago,
Illinois, commencing at 8:30 a.m. on July 25th, 2024.

Kathleen Koch v. Vantage Specialty Chemicals, Inc.; et al.
Proceedings had on 7/25/2024

Page 2

1 APPEARANCES:

2 REDGRAVE LLP
3 HON. NAN R. NOLAN (Ret.)
4 230 West Monroe Street
5 Suite 210
6 Chicago, Illinois 60606
7 Phone: 312.800.1968
8 E-mail: nnolan@redgravellp.com

9 Discovery Neutral

10 STINAR GOULD GRIECO & HENSLEY
11 MR. BRYCE T. HENSLEY
12 101 North Wacker Drive
13 Suite 100
14 Chicago, Illinois 60606
15 Phone: 312.728.7444
16 E-mail: bryce@sgghlaw.com

17 On behalf of the Plaintiff;

18 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
19 MS. KATIE J. WELCH
20 333 West Wolf Point Plaza
21 Chicago, Illinois 60654
22 Phone: 312.862.2000
23 E-mail: katie.welch@kirkland.com

24 and

25 ROPES & GRAY LLP
26 MR. JEFFREY J. BUSHOFSKY
27 191 North Wacker Drive
28 32nd Floor
29 Chicago, Illinois 60606
30 Phone: 312.845.1200
31 E-mail: jeffrey.bushofsky@ropesgray.com

32 On behalf of the Defendant Vantage Specialty
33 Chemicals, Inc.;

34

35

36

Kathleen Koch v. Vantage Specialty Chemicals, Inc.; et al.
Proceedings had on 7/25/2024

Page 3

1 APPEARANCES (continued):

2 JONES DAY
3 MR. PHILIP M. OLISS
4 110 North Wacker Drive
5 Suite 4800
6 Chicago, Illinois 60606
7 Phone: 312.782.3939
E-mail: poliss@jonesday.com

On behalf of the Defendant STERIS Isomedix Services, Inc.;

PEDERSEN & HOUP
MR. ANTHONY DeMARCO PESCE
MR. CHARLES M. GERING
161 North Clark Street
Suite 2700
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Phone: 312.641.6888
E-mails: apesce@pedersenhaupt.com
cgering@pedersenhaupt.com

On behalf of the Defendant Cosmed Group, Inc.;

K&L GATES LLP
MR. VINCENZO R. CHIMERA
MR. KENN BROTMAN
70 West Madison Street
Suite 3300
Chicago, Illinois 60602
Phone: 312.372.1121
E-mails: vincenzo.chimera@klgates.com
kenn.brotman@klgates.com

On behalf of PPG Industries, Inc.;

DLA PIPER LLP
MR. JOSEPH A. ROSELIUS
444 West Lake Street
Suite 900
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: 312.368.4000
E-mail: joseph.roselius@dlapiper.com

On behalf of BASF.

* * * * *

Kathleen Koch v. Vantage Specialty Chemicals, Inc.; et al.
Proceedings had on 7/25/2024

Page 24	Page 26
<p>1 Chris, of course, being so precise, he put it down, 2 but...</p> <p>3 THE COURT: I mean, I know the federal courts are 4 usually very quick with decisions on removal.</p> <p>5 JUDGE NOLAN: Because they can't wait to get rid of 6 it.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: I didn't know -- And I didn't know if 8 there was actually a deadline that it was imposed on 9 them to --</p> <p>10 MR. BUSHOFSKY: Your Honor, I can probably be more 11 objective than some other people because I feel like 12 Vantage doesn't have much of a dog in this particular 13 fight. They're removed. The federal judge has 14 jurisdiction now. He or she doesn't need to do anything 15 until someone challenges the removal and moves for 16 remand, and that process can take a short period of time 17 by maybe Cook County standards or it could take quite a 18 long time.</p> <p>19 THE COURT: Are you saying we have our own clock 20 here?</p> <p>21 MR. BUSHOFSKY: I don't know. I've only been here 22 for 30 years, and I'm still not sure.</p> <p>23 MR. OLISS: Judge, I think that's right. The 24 removal is effective upon filing of the removal which</p>	<p>1 JUDGE NOLAN: Okay.</p> <p>2 MR. CHIMERA: They have been assigned to a number 3 of different judges, so right now --</p> <p>4 JUDGE NOLAN: Oh, it has? Okay.</p> <p>5 MR. CHIMERA: But that may change. It's being 6 sorted out.</p> <p>7 JUDGE NOLAN: Okay.</p> <p>8 MR. HENSLEY: Just going back for a second, 9 Your Honor, on the motions to amend, I mean, we'll start 10 working on those right away, but I think the combination 11 of that with Knobbe -- not to cut this short by any 12 means so we can keep going, but I think we do need to 13 set something for next week in light of the deadlines 14 that we have. We can come back hopefully with some of 15 those motions to amend on file.</p> <p>16 THE COURT: And I canceled my vacation, which I was 17 scheduled to take tomorrow, because of my continuing 18 cold. So we can come back next week. That's not a 19 problem.</p> <p>20 JUDGE NOLAN: Judge, I do have one more thing. I'm 21 sorry.</p> <p>22 THE COURT: Sure. Never be sorry.</p> <p>23 JUDGE NOLAN: So this was an e-mail we got at 8:30 24 last night, and it is regarding third-party subpoena</p>
Page 25	Page 27
<p>1 deprives this Court of jurisdiction to enter orders 2 until such time as the case is remanded, I believe is 3 where we are.</p> <p>4 THE COURT: Now that you say that, I think that 5 triggers some old brain cells. I think that's correct.</p> <p>6 Well, let's do this. I mean, do we -- Have 7 the defendants provided a list of the removed cases to 8 the plaintiffs?</p> <p>9 MR. HENSLEY: We got, I think, 12 from Isomedix. 10 At least I did. I don't think I was on the service list 11 for PPG. I don't know about my co-counsel in the case. 12 So I think --</p> <p>13 THE COURT: If you could supply those to the 14 plaintiffs, I would appreciate it. I think that will 15 make it easier for them going forward with regard to any 16 motions that they are going to provide.</p> <p>17 MR. CHIMERA: We can provide a list.</p> <p>18 THE COURT: I think that would help.</p> <p>19 JUDGE NOLAN: Is there a -- Are the new cases going 20 to be assigned to the judge who has the first group? 21 Are they considered to be --</p> <p>22 MR. HENSLEY: That's a procedural question.</p> <p>23 MR. CHIMERA: That's a procedural question. I 24 think that's still being sorted out.</p>	<p>1 records. It's from the plaintiff. And Mr. Oliss -- 2 This everybody got also. And Chris has a suggestion on 3 this also.</p> <p>4 So plaintiff said they need our assistance, 5 that Isomedix has retained a third party to collect 6 Ms. Knobbe's medical records. Isomedix has informed us, 7 meaning the plaintiffs, that it will only make these 8 documents available to plaintiffs if the plaintiffs pay 9 their third-party vendor fees for the documents, and 10 the -- This gentleman can speak for himself, but it -- 11 Ms. Schuyler referred to the ESI protocol. It doesn't 12 sound like it's exactly on point, but there might be 13 something in the protocol talking about change -- or 14 what you do with the cost.</p> <p>15 So Chris being -- even in his absence, here is 16 what he would like -- or here is what he would suggest 17 is -- where is that one -- that Isomedix -- okay -- 18 we -- Our suggestion is, Isomedix should agree to 19 provide the document -- These are medical records of 20 Ms. Knobbe that they absolutely need. Isomedix should 21 agree to provide the documents under reservation of 22 rights to seek reimbursement of the costs later. If 23 Isomedix will not so agree, then the plaintiff should 24 pay under reservation of rights to seek reimbursement</p>

9 (Pages 24 to 27)